Appln. No.: 10/505,390
Amendment dated October 3, 2007
Response to Final Office Action of June 5, 2007

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Final Office Action of June 5, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claim 1 has been amended to incorporate the features of claims 2 and 3 thereinto and claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled. Support for the additional amendments to claim 1 can be found, for example, in Figure 1 and in the specification, at page 8, lines 11-19. It is respectfully submitted that the amendments to claim 1 merely incorporate the features of claims 2 and 3 and/or clarify the recitations of claim 1 and are made to place the claims in better form for appeal. The amendments to claim 1 will not require any additional search by the Examiner, and entry thereof is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 has been amended to depend from claim 1 and to correct minor informalities therein. Claim 5 has been amended to correct minor informalities therein.

Entry of the amendments to claims 4 and 5 is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 4-5 are pending following entry of this amendment.

### *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102*

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by WO 00/62505 to Ques et al. (hereinafter, "Ques").[1] Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Claim 1 recites a method of processing data encrypted according to an encryption method specific to a first domain such that the data cannot be decrypted without using a first secret specific to said first domain, the data being received in a presentation device connected to a network belonging to a second domain. According to claim 1 as amended, this method includes the steps of:

> (a) transmitting at least a portion of said encrypted data to a processing device connected to the network;
>
> (b) receiving, in said presentation device, processed data from said processing device, at least one element of said processed data being used by said presentation

---

[1] Applicant notes that in the prior Office Action dated September 22, 2006, the Examiner acknowledged that Ques did not describe the recited feature that the second secret is specific to the second domain, and instead relied on U.S. Patent 5,481,613 to Ford et al. to provide this missing element.

Page 4 of 7

device to decrypt said received data using a second secret specific to said second domain, said second secret being contained in the presentation device; wherein

the data received in the presentation device are encrypted using a first symmetric key, said first symmetric key being received with said data in a form encrypted using the first secret;

step (a) comprises transmitting to the processing device the first symmetric key encrypted using the first secret; and

step (b) comprises receiving from the processing device:

said first symmetric key encrypted using a second symmetric key; and

the second symmetric key encrypted using the second secret specific to the second domain; the method further comprising:

(c)     decrypting, using the second secret, the second encrypted symmetric key;

(d)     decrypting, using the second symmetric key, the first encrypted symmetric key; and

(e)     decrypting the data received by said presentation device using the first symmetric key.

Claim 1 as amended thus clarifies that a presentation device in the second domain receives data from the first domain that is encrypted using a first key, the first key being received in the presentation device with the data, and that the first key is decrypted using a second key, the second key being encrypted using a second secret stored in a processing device connected to the network of the presentation device.

This is very different from the method described by Ques. In Ques, the access device receives an encrypted data stream from a first network and sends it to a processing device in the second network, for example, a smartcard, that decrypts it using a secret known in the second network and then returns the decrypted data to a presentation device. See Ques at page 7, line 31 to page 8, line 34 and page 9, lines 13-34.

This is clearly not the same as the method recited in claim 1 in which the presentation device itself performs the decryption and recovers the original data stream. In the method according to claim 1, a presentation device in the second domain receives data from the first domain that is encrypted using a first key encrypted using a first secret, the first key being received in the presentation device with the data and being decrypted using a second key, and the second key being

Appln. No.: 10/505,390
Amendment dated October 3, 2007
Response to Final Office Action of June 5, 2007

encrypted by a second secret stored in a processing device connected to the presentation device, wherein the presentation device uses the second secret to decrypt the received data stream by decrypting the second key which in turn can be used to decrypt the first key to recover the original data stream. None of these features is described in Ques. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Ques, and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 over Ques is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 depends from claim 1 and is therefore distinguishable over Ques for the reasons stated above and further in view of the additional inventive steps recited therein.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 5 over Ques is respectfully requested.

### *Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103*

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 2 and 3 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ques in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,481,613 to Ford et al. (hereinafter "Ford).

The Examiner also rejects claims 4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ques in view of Ford, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,642,419 to Rosen (hereinafter "Rosen").

Claims 2 and 3 have been cancelled, thus mooting the rejection of those claims.

The rejection of claim 4 is respectfully traversed, and Applicant respectfully submits that claim 4, which depends from claim 1, is allowable over the combination of Ques, Ford, and Rosen. In a manner similar to Ford, Rosen does not describe the processing device element of claim 1 missing from Ques, nor does the Examiner cite Rosen for this purpose. Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Ques, Ford, and Rosen does not describe all of the recited features of claim 4, and that claim 4 therefore is allowable over the cited art, both in view of its dependence on an allowable base claim, and further in view of the additional inventive steps recited therein. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 and allowance is respectfully requested.

Page 6 of 7

**RECEIVED**
**CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

**OCT 0 3 2007**

## CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance with claims 1 and 4-5, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at 609-734-6440.

Respectfully submitted,
Alain Durand

_Oct. 3, 2007_

Date

_Catherine A. Ferguson_
Catherine A. Ferguson
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 40,877
609/734-6440

THOMSON LICENSING LLC
Patent Operations
2 Independence Way
PO Box 5312
Princeton, NJ 08543-0028

Page 7 of 7